UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450. Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/737,229	12/15/2003	Steven M. Ayer	200314067-1	6374
	7590 10/29/200 CKARD COMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD			NATNITHITHADHA, NAVIN	
	INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3735	
		•		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/29/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/737,229	AYER ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Navin Natnithithadha	3735	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with th	ne correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS	APPLICATION IN CONDITION F	OR ALLOWANCE.	
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the follor places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods: The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing 	owing replies: (1) an amendment, otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) are with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply	affidavit, or other evidence, which in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3)	
b) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing by The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set for	orth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN 706.07(f). e on which the petition under 37 CFR xtension and the corresponding amous shortened statutory period for reply cer than three months after the mailing	THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee unt of the fee. The appropriate extension fee originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as	
may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b NOTICE OF APPEAL)).		
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))	, to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a br	rief, will <u>not</u> be entered because	
 (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 		NOTE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or		reducing or simplifying the issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally	rejected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.7	116 and 41.33(a)).		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	•	As Completed and an advantage of the second	
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	illowable if submitted in a separa	ite, timely filed amendment canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:		will be entered and an explanation of	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but	ut before or on the date of filing a	Notice of Appeal will not be entered	
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing			

13. Other: _____.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

CHARLES A. MARMOR II SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**

showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Continuation of 3. NOTE: As to claim 1, Applicant states, in Applicant's Remarks, p. 9, filed on 17 October 2007, that the "[Amendment, filed on 17 October 2007] amends claim 1 based generally on claim 10 (now canceled)." However, the amended claim 1 contains the limitation: "wherein the identification circuit is configured such that at least one part of the identification circuit dissolves AS A RESULT OF ingestion to produce a change in electromagnetic coupling to the sensing device, THEREBY indicating that the ingestible object has been ingested" (emphasis added by Examiner) which differs from the original claim 10 by addiing additional phrases (indicated by capilization). These additional phrases change the scope of Applicant's original claim 10 by changing the relationship between identification circuit, the sensing device, part of the identification circuit that is dissolved, and the indication of ingestion. Thus, further consideration and a new search are required to determine patentability.

As to claim 11, Applicant's amendment to the claim inserting "monitoring electromagnetic coupling of the identification circuit to the sensing device to determine whether the ingestible object has been ingested" changes the scope of original claim 11. Thus further consideration and a new search are required to determine patentability.